

Remarks

In the final Office Action of August 15, 2005, the Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of “Intermediaries: New Places for Producing and Manipulating Web Content,” by Barrett et al. (“Barrett”) in view of “How to Personalize the Web,” by Barrett et al. (“BMK”); and rejects claims 6-11, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, BMK, and U.S. Patent No. 5,752,022 to Chiu et al. (“Chiu”).

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 21-26 are pending.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-4 and 21-24 in view of Barrett and BMK.

Independent claim 1 is directed to an information retrieval system that serves to retrieve information requested by a client machine from a remote server via a network. The system includes an intermediate server coupled to a network, the intermediate server receiving requests and performing processing on responses to the requests before returning the responses to a client machine. The system further includes at least one third-party application plug-in installed on the intermediate server, the third-party application plug-in filters the response to render at least one feature available at the client machine without counterpart plug-ins at the client machine. A history manager is operable on the intermediate server and stores results of historical requests from the client machine and provides the results of the historical requests to the client machine in response to a view history request from the client machine. The received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to

be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server.

Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose the features recited in claim 1. For example, neither Barrett nor BMK discloses or suggests, as recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server.

In the final Office Action, the Examiner pointed to a number of sections of Barrett as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1, including: pages 512-513, sections 3.2 and Table 1; page 511, first two paragraphs in Section 2; pages 513-514, Section 3.3.1; and the first paragraph on page 515. (Final Office Action, pages 3 and 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of Barrett.

Barrett discloses an intermediary approach to manipulating web content using a proxy server. (Barrett, section 3 "Architecture"). In Section 3.2, Barrett discusses the operation of Barrett's web browser intelligence (WBI) architecture. Requests received at the WBI follow the three steps discussed in section 3.2 of Barrett. These steps are:

- 1) The original request is compared with the rules for all Request Editors. The Request Editors whose rule conditions are satisfied by the request are allowed to edit the request in priority order.
- 2) The request that results from this Request Editor chain is compared with the rules for all Generators. The request is sent to the highest priority Generator whose rule is satisfied. If that Generator rejects the request, subsequent valid Generators are called in priority order until one produces a document.
- 3) The request and document are used to determine which Document Editors and Monitors should see the document on its way back to the original requester. The document is modified by each Document Editor whose rule conditions are satisfied in priority order. Monitors are also configured to monitor the document either (a) as it is produced

by the generator, (b) as it is delivered from the intermediary, or (c) after a particular Document Editor.

- 4) Finally, the document is delivered to the requester, which may be the browser if this is the first intermediary in the chain.

(Barrett, section 3.2). This disclosure of Barrett provides for a number of steps that are to be followed when handling requests. None of these steps, however, disclose or suggest, as recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server. Instead, Barrett discloses four steps that are performed for received requests. None of these four steps disclose or suggest anything like this feature of claim 1. Neither in this section of Barrett, nor in any other section, does Barrett disclose assuming a request to be destined for a remote server when the received request is not a view history request or a login request.

The Examiner also points to Table 1 of Barrett as disclosing this feature of claim 1. Table 1 of Barrett describes a number of MEG (monitor/editor/generator) building blocks. The MEGs of Barrett are described as the basic building blocks that are used to construct intermediary applications. (see Barrett, Section 3.1). None of the MEGs described in Table 1 can be said to disclose or suggest a system in which received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to an intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote servers, as is recited in claim 1.

The Examiner further cites the first two paragraphs in Section 2 of Barrett as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1. The first two paragraphs in Section 2 generally describe an intermediary approach to web access in which a web browser issues requests that are handled by an intermediary (first paragraph of Section 2) and a proxy

approach in which a proxy acts as an intermediary that has a configurable response (second paragraph in Section 2). This section of Barrett does not disclose or suggest, however, as is recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote servers. Nowhere does this section of Barrett mention a view history request, a login request, or make any assumptions about the destinations for such requests.

The Examiner further cites Section 3.3.1 of Barrett as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1. This section of Barrett describes a cookie manager Plugin that can be implemented at an intermediary. As with the previous sections of Barrett discussed herein, Applicants submit that this section of Barrett also does not disclose or suggest, as is recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote servers.

The Examiner further cites the first paragraph on page 515 of Barrett as allegedly disclosing this feature of claim 1. This section of Barrett generally describes identifying users through a known HTTP Proxy Authentication mechanism. Although this section of Barrett may disclose the general concept of logging-in or identifying a user, the fact that a user can be identified by the intermediary system of Barrett in no way discloses or suggests, as recited in claim 1, that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote servers.

The Examiner also relies on BMK in rejecting claim 1. In particular, the Examiner relies on BMK for the disclosure of a history manager. (Final Office Action, page 4). Applicants have reviewed BMK and submit that BMK fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Barrett. That is, BMK, as with Barrett, fails to disclose or suggest that received requests that are not view history requests or login requests to the intermediate server are assumed to be destined for a remote server and are forwarded by the intermediate server to the remote server, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 1 is improper and should be withdrawn. The rejection of claims 2-4 and 21-24 based on Barrett and BMK under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is also improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 1.

Claims 6-11, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Barrett, BMK, and Chiu.

Claim 6 is directed to an intermediary server system that comprises a web server that receives requests for resources from client machines via a network and a HTTP handler operatively connected to said web server. The HTTP handler receives the requests for resources, modifies the requests when the requests are intended for remote servers, and forwards the modified requests for resources to remote servers. An HTML parser receives the resources supplied by the remote servers in response to the modified requests, and modifies the resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to an intermediary server system instead of a remote server. A

history manager provides resources that were previously requested by the client machine in response to a view history request received from the client machine. The HTTP handler determines that the requests are intended for the remote servers by assuming the requests are intended for the remote servers when the requests are not view history requests or login requests to the web server.

In rejecting claim 6, the Examiner relies on Barrett to disclose many of the features recited in claim 6, but relies on BMK to disclose the history manager of claim 6 and relies on Chiu to disclose aspects of the recited HTML parser relating to modifying resources such that at least certain links contained therein are modified to be directed to an intermediary server system instead of a remote server. (final Office Action, pages 7 and 8).

Barrett, BMK, and Chiu, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 6. In particular, none of these references discloses or suggests an HTTP handler that determines that requests are intended for the remote servers by assuming the requests are intended for the remote servers when the requests are not view history requests or login requests to the web server. Barrett and BMK were previously discussed with regard to a similar feature in claim 1. Based on similar rationale as that given for claim 1, Applicants submit that Barrett and BMK fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 6. The Applicants have reviewed Chiu and submit that Chiu similarly fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 6.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that Barrett, BMK, and Chiu, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest each of the features recited in claim 6. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 6 is improper and should be withdrawn. The

rejections of claims 7-11, 25, and 26 based on Barrett, BMK, and Chiu under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are improper and should be withdrawn, at least by virtue of the dependency of these claims from claim 6.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Applicants respectfully point out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY & SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: 

Brian E. Ledell
Reg. No. 42,784

11240 Waples Mill Road
Suite 300
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
(571) 432-0800

Date: October 11, 2005